

Thompson (CA)	Udall (NM)	Wexler
Thompson (MS)	Velazquez	Weygand
Thurman	Vento	Wise
Tierney	Visclosky	Woolsey
Towns	Waters	Wu
Trafficant	Watt (NC)	Wynn
Turner	Waxman	
Udall (CO)	Weiner	

NOT VOTING—3

Kennedy McDermott Peterson (PA)

□ 1455

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

“A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to sections 105 and 211 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 257 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 257

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion

except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for one hour.

There was no objection.

□ 1500

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 2561, the Fiscal Year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.Res. 257 is an open rule for a strong, bipartisan bill. It is a bill that will allow us to rest a little easier at night, knowing that our national defense is stronger and that we are taking good care of our troops. I have always admired the patriotism and dedication of our military personnel, especially given the poor quality of military life for our enlisted men and women. But today we are doing something to improve military pay, housing and benefits. We are helping to take some of our enlisted men off food stamps by giving them a 4.8 percent pay raise. And we have added \$258 million for a variety of health care efforts. We are boosting the basic allowance for housing, increasing retention pay for pilots and prompting the GAO to study how we can do better.

But along with personnel, we have got to take care of our military readiness. We live in a dangerous world, and Congress is working to protect our friends and family back home from our enemies abroad. We are providing for a national missile defense system so that we can stop a warhead from places like China or North Korea if that day ever

comes. We are boosting the military's budget for weapons and ammunition, something they sorely need, and we are providing \$37 billion for research and development so our forces will have top-of-the-line equipment to do their jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying bill. Now more than ever we must improve our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000 and in support of the men and women in uniform who serve this country. This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. In the challenging world in which we live, this bill begins to bring military spending to levels that can ensure that our Armed Forces can meet and exceed the missions they are assigned.

But, that being said, I am concerned that the Committee on Appropriations has chosen to delete funding for the procurement of the first six F-22 fighter aircraft. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that this pause in the program effectively kills the development of a fighter aircraft that is the key to the long-term defense of our Nation and our allies.

The Air Force and the President are also extremely concerned about the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations. In a statement of administration policy delivered to the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon, the administration made clear its opposition to the reduction in funding for the F-22. I would like to quote from the statement of administration policy: “The F-22 is optimized to perform a crucial role, achieving air superiority early in any future conflict, even against adversaries equipped with the advanced weapons that will be developed in the first part of the next century. No other aircraft, including the F-15 or the proposed Joint Strike Fighter, will be able to fulfill that role.”

Mr. Speaker, this weapons program is a critical component in our military arsenal. It will serve as an effective deterrent and will ensure our dominance in the skies. I encourage the Committee on Appropriations to reconsider its position and hope that when the bill comes back from conference that the F-22 will be part of the total package of national defense funding for the first fiscal year in the new century.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the committee for its dedication to ensuring that the issues relating to quality of life, benefits, and training for the soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines we depend upon for our national security are squarely addressed. Certainly this bill does not go far enough, especially when we are facing

critical shortfalls in filling the ranks and retaining our skilled personnel. But under the budgetary constraints that currently exist, the committee has taken at least the beginning steps to address these enormous problems.

This bill provides a 4.8 percent pay raise for all military personnel and contains increases in funds for the Aviation Continuation Pay bonus and supports the request for the Career Enlisted Flyer Incentive Pay program, all in an effort to address the major retention problems our Armed Forces are facing, especially in the Air Force.

Given the monumental demands that have been placed on our military in the past decade, addressing quality of life issues should be of paramount importance. Our military is being stretched too thin, operations are spread around the globe, and the expectations of future threats will certainly not diminish. The Congress must meet our part of the bargain. We must increase incentives for military men and women to continue to serve their country by ensuring that they are paid at levels that are greater than subsistence living and that their benefits are competitive to the civilian sector.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we must provide the best equipment to get the job done. While we can be assured that today our equipment and technology and the training to go with it are superior to any other fighting force in the world, we must look forward to be sure that we continue to enjoy that advantage. This bill, in many respects, sets us on that path. Again, I am deeply concerned about the zero funding for the acquisition of the first six of the F-22 Raptor fighter aircraft, but I do support the inclusion of \$351 million for the acquisition of 15 F-16C fighter aircraft as well as \$296 million for modifications and upgrades for F-16s currently in service. The bill also provides \$344 million for upgrades for the bomber fleet which includes the B-52, the B-1 and the B-2 which all proved their mettle during the recent air campaign over Kosovo and Serbia.

The committee has provided \$856 million for the acquisition of 11 V-22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft, the vehicle which will carry the assault troops of the Marine Corps into battle if and when we are forced to send them there. The bill provides \$2.2 billion for ammunition for all four services and, most importantly, provides \$93.7 billion to operate and maintain the four branches of the armed services. This money will help replenish aircraft spare parts stores depleted from the prolonged operations in Iraq and Yugoslavia. It will address shortfalls in rotational training centers and depot maintenance. Operations and maintenance is the lifeblood of the machinery of the military and is an account that we cannot afford to ignore.

But, Mr. Speaker, as the needs of our military continue to grow, as our obli-

gations around the world continue to expand, we must find a way to fund the programs and weapons systems that will be required to meet these responsibilities. If this year's budget dilemma is any guide to what we will be facing in the next few years, I cannot understand how my Republican colleagues can in good conscience endorse a tax cut plan that will, in essence, eviscerate the military. That plan guarantees that there will be no money in the new century to adequately fund our military. I cannot support a fiscal policy that will expand military spending through deficit financing, and quite frankly there is no need to do so. The Republican majority is endangering our national security just when we have begun to restore the infrastructure, both human and machine, of our military.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and I support this rule which will allow the House to consider this important bill. But I cannot support the policy of the Republican majority that endangers the national security of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the Defense appropriations bill. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), members of the Committee on Appropriations and the staffs for their effort in crafting this bill. I support the rule. I encourage all of the Members to support this fine rule. The committee has put forth legislation that reflects the great support this Congress has for 1.5 million men and women in uniform who selflessly defend our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of our military personnel and their families, and I am honored to serve them here in Washington. Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base are in my district, and I am humbled every time I meet with any of the 45,000 dedicated Americans whose mission it is to maintain a strategic crisis response force, manned and trained to deploy rapidly anywhere in the world, prepared to fight upon arrival and win. This kind of dedication is unique, and I am pleased to support the rule and the legislation that will extend these American patriots an across-the-board 4.8 percent pay increase in basic pay.

I must note, however, that I do take exception with the committee's decision to cancel production funding for the F-22 Raptor. As member of the Committee on Armed Services, I find it alarming that we would hastily turn our backs on a program which represents 15 years of research, development, rigorous testing and a \$16 billion investment. For a bill that in all other

areas represents the appropriate commitment to our military needs, this elimination in funding is a little shortsighted and I hope we will change that.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to returning to my district to tell the young men and women of Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base that their Congress has done the right thing and has served them well, as they have done for us time and time again.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise today to remind my colleagues in the House of some of the past decisions that we have made and how effectively they were used in Kosovo. The House on four separate occasions over the last 4 years voted to continue funding for the B-2 bomber, amongst a lot of criticism by the GAO and the press that the B-2 would not work, could not fly in the rain, all kinds of criticism. But when the President called on it to be used in Kosovo, I was proud to see these young men fly these planes 31 hours over and back with several aerial refuelings, using JDAMs, a weapon that cost less than \$20,000 per weapon, and do more destruction and really carry the air war at a time when many of our other aircraft could not be used because they require laser guidance. I think this is a testament of the commitment of this Congress, where year after year after year we added money to give the B-2 a conventional capability to improve its capabilities and then to see it work. I think it is a testament to the fact that there are people serving in the Congress who have many years of experience on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, on the Armed Services Committee, and they review these programs very carefully. In this case I was very proud when I went out with the President, with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and two of the pilots came up to me and said, "Congressman, if your committee hadn't added the money, \$40 million for GATSCAM which gave the B-2 a conventional capability one year earlier than was expected, we would have not been able to use it in this war." JDAMs would have taken more time for training and getting it on the planes and we would not have been able to use it in this war.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can take full credit for that. If it had not been for his effort, that would not have happened.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the comment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, our former chairman and ranking member. It was my amendment, but I had bipartisan support. This has never been something that has just

been my deal. It has been our commitment. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), now the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), all of us worked on this. But what we showed is that there are some important things that we in the Congress can do to improve the security of this country. I was pleased, because I think in the early days had we not had the B-2 when we only had TALCMs and Tomahawks, if none of our planes could have worked, then we would have looked very foolish. There were some people who were critical of this war. It might have undermined even further the support in this country.

I just wanted to make that report here today. The B-2 did very, very well. I appreciate all the people in the House who supported it, and those who were critical. I am glad we were able to show and prove in reality that it could stand the test. It did. It was because of the pilots, because of the people who do the low observability work, the mechanics. The turnaround time was like 16 hours per plane. Some people said it would take hundreds of hours. All of that proved wrong because we had great people at Whiteman doing a fantastic job, and it is a testament to the good work of the men and women in the military service.

□ 1515

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for many of us defense has been our life, supporting both in combat and in the United States Congress. It is something that we believe in, we are entrenched, and I believe, as Ronald Reagan, that peace does come through strength.

We met with the Prime Minister of Israel just days ago, and he stressed that a strong United States means a strong Israel, that a weakened United States military means that Israel is at great risk. But I would extend that beyond, to all of our allies.

One of the lessons learned is that in Kosovo we can little afford in the future with NATO to fly 86 percent of the sorties and drop 90 percent of the ordinance. We cannot do that and maintain our services.

We have made a very difficult decision supported by the members on the conference itself, and I would say, first of all, I have got a very good friend in the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON). He is an Air Force hero. He still bears the scars from his torture, and he wants the same things that we do for national security in this, and the gentleman from Texas and I may disagree on how we get there, but I want to tell my colleagues there is nobody that I have more respect for. But let me give my colleagues my side of the story on the F-22.

First of all, if I was an Air Force pilot, I would say to my friends, I would look forward to flying the F-22. Why? It is because there is a threat out there that the Russians have today that are developing in the SU-35 and SU-37. This is a fighter like we have never seen before. It is deadly, and the F-22 is scheduled for the year 2010 or 2005 for IOIC, which brings it into the fleet.

But let me tell my colleagues that there is a threat today, a threat today that our men and women are going to have to face. This is not a fiction; this is not a vapor. I have flown these assets. I have flown aircraft against these assets myself. This is not secondhand. If our F-15 drivers and our F-16 drivers and F-14 and F-18 face this threat, and I cannot tell my colleagues what this asset is because it is top secret, but if I was Speaker, I would demand that every single Member of Congress go through this briefing up on the fourth floor, and I will tell my colleagues why: because in the intercept against this asset; that is, beak to beak when one is coming head on with the enemy, our pilots die 95 percent of the time. That is today, not tomorrow. In the actual engagement itself, these assets kill me three times before I can bring a weapon to bear. That is today, not down the line. Thank God that this asset was not exported to Kosovo because, do my colleagues know the standoff weapons that we had? Our aircraft were going to die; our pilots would have died.

But where is that asset today? Russia is transporting this asset to China, to Iran, Iraq and North Korea, and take a look at where we are likely to get involved in the near future into a conflict today. I want our kids to be able to go up and fight.

I am alive today because I had better training than the enemy, and I had better equipment. I think the F-22 in the future will be a great airplane. But it is only 5 percent tested. The cost of the F-22 is not all the fault of the Air Force. When we cut 750 aircraft to 339, our cost per airplane goes up because we pile all of that research and development. But that cost is nearing \$200 million for each fighter.

How many can we buy? I do not care how great the airplane is, and we have needs right now that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) have identified that our kids to fight in a war tomorrow need the A9X.

When the British were in the Falklands War, they did not aim nine in Lima in the procurement to get it a year later. They needed it now. We need the A9X now to be able to fight this asset. We need a helmet-mounted site, not partially funded. We need it now. The radar that we will see

through the enemy jammer so we can have some idea where he is before he kills us, we need it now, and we are taking the \$1.8 million and spreading that down to those systems that are going to keep our kids alive today.

I want General Ryan, who is a good friend of mine, Chief of the Air Force, to stand up and say: Mr. President, this is an emergency, and my colleague says Republicans want a cut. Well, we are there today because the President has gutted defense time and time again, time and time with Kosovo, with Bosnia, with all of the other places we have gone, have taken out of that already low budget.

But the total money available for those systems is not there.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the gentleman this question: in the 10-year budget that we have been just discussing as we talked about this tax bill, the Clinton administration has \$198 billion more in it for defense than does the Republican budget which starts capping in about 2004 and goes right through the last 10 years.

Now I just want the gentleman to know we are always honest with each other. As my colleagues know, the President has increased this budget by 112 billion. The gentleman and I would like to see it be increased more. But we got to be honest here. The budget that my colleagues have got cut is \$198 billion below the President.

So those guys got a little work to do on their side.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. First of all, does my colleague believe that this President on any budget that he has had in the outyears, always later, always later, when he is not even going to be here, he will beef it up? We need the \$60 billion now, and the President continually cuts it.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time just to say this.

In the last 3 years the President's number for defense has been higher than the Republican number.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We added \$36 billion; that is negative. We have added \$36 billion, and the gentleman knows that.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me. I rise in support of the defense appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2000 and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the defense appropriation bill provides a total of \$266 billion for the Department of Defense while at the same time meeting the goals contained in the 1997 balanced budget

agreement. With this bill we will help reverse 15 straight years of decreased defense budgets in real terms.

As a new member of this subcommittee, I am particularly pleased with the growing investment that we make in our national security with this bill. Specifically, this bill provides \$15.5 billion more than was appropriated in 1999. This money is desperately needed to keep our troops combat ready and our research and development efforts on track to ensure that our soldiers are equipped with the best technology available.

I would especially like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for their hard work and guidance throughout this entire year. This committee's leadership made the tough choices so that crucial funding is provided to protect our Nation and keep our troops safe and successful in the field.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has no greater duty than to ensure that our brave young men and women who put their lives on the line for our country have the resources they need to do their job safely and successfully. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I thank the capable and knowledgeable staff of the committee who assisted all of us in putting this legislation together.

I support this rule of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Defense Appropriations bill for FY 2000 and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Appropriations bill, H.R. 2561, provides a total of \$266 billion for the Department of Defense while at the same time meeting the goals continued in the 1997 balanced Budget Agreement. As a member of this Subcommittee, I am particularly pleased with the growing investment that we make in our Nation's security. Specifically, this bill provides \$15.5 billion dollars more than was appropriated in 1999. This money is desperately needed to keep our troops combat ready and our research and development efforts on track to ensure that our soldiers are equipped with the best technology available.

I would especially like to commend my colleagues, Chairman LEWIS and Ranking member MURTHA, for their hard work and assistance throughout this year. This Committee's leadership made the tough choices so that crucial funding is provided to protect our nation and keep our troops safe and successful in the field. Mr. Chairman, Congress has no greater duty than to ensure that our brave, young men and women, who put their lives on the line for our country, have the resources they need to do their job safely and successfully.

In addition, let me thank the capable and knowledgeable staff of the Defense Committee who assisted all of us in putting this legislation together.

While the decisions made in this bill were not easy, I believe that they were the right de-

cisions. With this legislation, we will help reverse 15 straight years of decreasing defense budgets in real terms. Despite the end of the Cold War, we still find American troops deployed all across the globe, from Eastern Europe to Asia to Africa. Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the job our troops have done and I am especially proud that this bill provides funding for the needed 4.8 percent pay raise for our troops.

H.R. 2561 also puts a great emphasis on the readiness and modernization of our military. With rogue nations like Iraq and North Korea developing advanced military technology, now is not the time to shortchange our nation's military readiness. Unfortunately, that is exactly what has been happening over the last several years. For evidence of this worrisome situation, we need only consider the effect that the Kosovo mission has had on our current obligations in the Persian Gulf and elsewhere. The Committee addressed this situation by adding over \$2.3 billion for readiness shortfalls identified by the armed services. This funding will help secure the spare parts needed to keep our military fully operational as they move into the next century.

Finally, let me say a word about the importance of research and development. As we enter the next century, technology, especially the digitalization of weapons systems, will play a critical role in the success of our troops in the field. This bill provides \$37 billion for these activities in order to keep our technological advantage on the battlefield. Much of this important research is done by our civilian workforce, which by any account, is quickly aging. This investment will help to ensure that our technology continues to be on the cutting edge and it will ensure that new qualified researchers can be added to workforce in this important arena.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2561 is a well balanced bill which funds the future readiness and modernization requirements of the DOD, while taking steps to ensure that the quality of life of our service members is maintained and enhanced. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also urge adoption of this rule and support for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### LIMITING DEBATE ON BARR OF GEORGIA AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of the bill (H.R. 2561) in the Committee of the Whole that, one, all debate time on amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) and the amendments thereto be limited to 60 minutes, equally divided between the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) and myself; and two, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) be allowed to withdraw the amendment prior to action thereupon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 257 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2561.

□ 1527

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAMP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise first to ask the membership for their support for this very important bill. It involves the national defense of our country. In doing so, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my personal appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have been not just cooperative, but who have been truly professional in the best possible sense in presenting their viewpoints regarding a number of items that are very important and will consider as we go forward with the debate.